REMARKS:

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims.

By this Amendment, claims 1-11, 13 and 14 have been amended, and claim 18 has been added. No new matter has been presented. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith. Thus, claims 1-18 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103:

In item 4 on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025832 (Swart), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0256130 (Gonzalez). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Swart does not teach or suggest, "delivering a compound contents to a portable terminal, where "the compound contents [is] a combination of a plurality of contents portions in time series, and each contents portions [is] partially fetched in time dimension from one of the contents stored in one of the storage units", as recited in claim 1. See also claim 14 reciting similar features.

In contrast, Swart discusses a system that alleges to solve the problem derived from the local and regional nature of television delivery systems (see, Fig.4 including corresponding text). The system includes an aggregator that includes a request and results processing server, a search engine server and a contents acquisition server and contents delivery server. The request and results processing server receives a request for a program. The search engine server searches for the program and the content acquisition server acquires a program for delivery to the user.

As discussed above, the independent claims patentably distinguish over Swart. Further, as Gonzalez merely discusses compiling application data based on scene description data for one or more media objects, Gonzalez does not cure the deficiencies of Swart regarding claims of the present application.

Specifically, Gonzalez is directed to a multimedia publishing system for wireless devices which includes a database server 102, an application server 104, a presentation server 106 and

9

a media player of a wireless client device 108. The application server 104 is responsible for encoding, transcoding, resizing refactoring and reformatting media objects for delivery by the presentation server, and provides content to the presentation server in the correct format and time sequence. The presentation server compiles application data from the application server 104.

But Swart and Gonzalez do not teach or suggest delivering a compound contents to the portable terminal, which the compound contents is a combination of a plurality of contents portions in time series, each contents portions being partially fetched in time dimension from one of the contents stored in one of the storage units. Meaning, Swart and Gonzalez are silent regarding the feature(s) of current claims 1 and 14.

Further, even assuming arguendo that Gonzalez does disclose the features discussed by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no rationale to combine the cited references. The Examiner stated that the combination of the references would be obvious in order to assemble each discrete media instance correctly in time and provide a continuous presentation of the media to the users.

The record, however, fails to provide the required evidence of a motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform such modification. While Gonzalez may provide a reason for media data packet containing all of the data required to define an instance of the media object element for a particular discrete point in time, Swart fails to suggest why a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to incorporate object control packets encapsulating control signals that operate on the object at discrete instances in time and appear in correct time sequence such as discussed in Gonzalez.

Even assuming the combination, the present invention is patentalby distinguishable over Swart and Gonzalez for the above mentioned reasons.

Claims depending from the independent include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by Swart and Gonzalez.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Swart and Gonzalez. The dependent claims are also independently patentable.

For example, as recited in claim 2, deciding "an identity between said instruction information produced in said instruction information production and said instruction information stored in said management server", "executing an in-management-server first control... when

10

the decision shows the produced instruction information is identical... using said compound contents stored in a state associated with the stored instruction information as said compound contents to be delivered to said portable terminal in said delivering and, when the decision shows no identity therebetween, transmitting the produced instruction information to said intermediate apparatus." Swart and Gonzalez, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claim 2.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 18 has been added to recite, "producing compound contents oriented to said portable terminal by combining the contents portions according to time series based on the instruction information", where the compound contents is "a combination of a plurality of contents portions in time series, and each contents portions is partially fetched in time dimension from one of contents stored." Swart and Gonzalez, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claim 18.

Therefore, it is submitted that new claim 18 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 09/01/2009

By: _Temnit Afework_
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501